

Employers Are Responsible for Many Industrial Accidents, Morrison Says

A. F. of L. Secretary Says Employers Not Install Adequate Safety Devices and Legislatives Refuse to Enact Compulsory Measures — Workers Must Rely on Unions.

Columbus, Ohio.—The charge that employers are in great part responsible for industrial accidents and that the workers have never been adequately protected until they use their organized power for their purpose was made by Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, in an address on the "Workers' Liability in Safety" before the Fifth All-Ohio State Congress and Exhibit here.

"Workers are the sufferers. Whether an accident results in a disability, Mr. Morrison said, it is the worker who suffers and suffers to a degree for which the benefits of the workmen's compensation laws do not at all compensate. In tens of thousands of cases where the worker's earnings are reduced, injured or destroyed, not only does the worker receive a lowered standard of living, but his aspirations and rights are also reduced. The American Federation of Labor, Morrison said, is not only interested in the safety of the worker, but in the safety of the community as a whole. In the case of fatal accidents, it is again the worker who pays the family expenses who pay for the great loss."

35,000 Killed Every Year. Stressing the statistical record of industrial accidents, Mr. Morrison said that conservative estimates indicate that the number of industrial fatalities in the United States is 35,000 per year, and that non-fatal industrial fatalities are 1,000,000 per year. He said that the average mind can visualize 300 workers dying in a year, 33 workers are killed and 3,300 injured during the war years that are compiled to show the magnitude of the problem.

Three-Fourths of Accidents Preventable. "Qualitatively this is the picture of the safety and casualty record of the United States. It is not by any means the most in the world, but it is a picture of a terrible situation. Reliable authorities agree that fully 75 per cent of these accidents are preventable. This means that every year 15,000 workers are needlessly killed and injured, and 1,500,000 workers are needlessly injured. The American Federation of Labor is not only interested in the safety of the worker, but in the safety of the community as a whole. In the case of fatal accidents, it is again the worker who pays the family expenses who pay for the great loss."

Employers Responsible. To illustrate his claim that employers are responsible for the safety of the worker, Morrison said that the control is largely responsible for industrial accidents. He said that in the coal industry in which 3,000 workers have been killed in the last ten years, the control is largely responsible for the safety of the worker.

State Laws Defective. He pointed out that State laws are required to make good dusting compacts and that therefore it is the duty of mine accidents due to explosion or fire. He said that the control is largely responsible for the safety of the worker.

He claimed that the scant regard for the safety of the workers' bodies shown by the coal mining companies and the characterizes large numbers of employers and their industries. The major responsibility rests with the employers and the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

He stated that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

He stated that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

He stated that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

He stated that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

He stated that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

He stated that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

He stated that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection. He said that the workers must rely on their unions for protection.

BUDGET BALANCERS SPLIT ON FEDERAL PAY CUTS

The President and the House Economy Committee Disagree on Plans to Reduce Federal Pay by \$75,000,000 Annually from Government Employees.

Washington.—Wide disagreement on pay cutting schemes broke out in Government circles among the budget balancers who are estimating millions of dollars from steady stream Federal employees in the form of a cut in their salaries, living allowances and working conditions.

The pay slashes in the Economy Committee bill of House of Representatives proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

President Hoover presented his five-day week plan. Under this scheme he proposed to reduce the salaries of all Federal employees by 10 per cent. He said that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

On the other hand, the House Economy Committee proposed a 10 per cent reduction in the salaries of all Federal employees. It was stated that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

MAYOR OF MINNEAPOLIS VETOES CITY PAY CUT

Anderson Says Government Should Maintain Living Standards—Wage Cuts Injure Both Labor and Business and Threaten City Government.

Minneapolis, Minn.—William A. Anderson, Mayor of Minneapolis, vetoed an ordinance which would reduce the salaries of city employees by 10 per cent. He said that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

"In vetoing this resolution, which I should feel that it is the duty of the Mayor to veto, I am not only protecting the city government, but I am also protecting the living standards of the people of Minneapolis. I am also protecting the living standards of the people of Minneapolis."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

Government Should Maintain Living Standards. "The Government should maintain the living standards of the people of Minneapolis. I am not only protecting the city government, but I am also protecting the living standards of the people of Minneapolis."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

"A reduction of wages of public employees would do much to indirectly be followed by other reductions in private industry. There is no one, however, who would like to see the United States in a position where the salaries of public employees are reduced by 10 per cent."

Green Opposes Using 5-Day Week To Victimize Federal Employees

A. F. of L. Chief Says Reduced Earnings, Loss of Leave Without Pay, and Other Penalties Tied to Shorter Work Week Destroy Its Value—Labor Is Overworked to Balance Budget While Congress Refuses to Help Jobless.

Washington.—The five-day week for Federal employees would be a cruel and inhuman device, said William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in a statement before the House Committee on the Economy. He said that this would amount to \$75,000,000 annually from Government workers.

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor has been tremendously interested in the proposal of the five-day week. It is a principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor has been tremendously interested in the proposal of the five-day week. It is a principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor has been tremendously interested in the proposal of the five-day week. It is a principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor has been tremendously interested in the proposal of the five-day week. It is a principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor has been tremendously interested in the proposal of the five-day week. It is a principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor has been tremendously interested in the proposal of the five-day week. It is a principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor has been tremendously interested in the proposal of the five-day week. It is a principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."

"The American Federation of Labor has consistently advocated the application of the five-day week to public and private industry," Mr. Green said. "It is an economic principle which has been demonstrated by the experience of the American Federation of Labor."